

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Amdocs Development Ltd., Amdocs Software Systems Ltd. and Amdocs Software Solutions LLC v. Calton Denssy
Case No. D2024-5280

1. The Parties

The Complainants are Amdocs Development Ltd., Cyprus, Amdocs Software Systems Ltd., Ireland, and Amdocs Software Solutions LLC, Hungary, represented by Liad Whatstein & Co., Israel.

The Respondent is Calton Denssy, Germany.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <amdocs.works> is registered with NameSilo, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on December 22, 2024. On December 23, 2024, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On December 23, 2024, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain name which differed from the named Respondent (PrivacyGuardian.org) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on December 24, 2024, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainant did not file an amendment to the Complaint.

The Center verified that the Complaint satisfied the formal requirements of the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Policy” or “UDRP”), the Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Rules”), and the WIPO Supplemental Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Supplemental Rules”).

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on January 3, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was January 23, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on January 24, 2025.

The Center appointed Miguel B. O'Farrell as the sole panelist in this matter on January 30, 2025. The Panel finds that it was properly constituted. The Panel has submitted the Statement of Acceptance and Declaration of Impartiality and Independence, as required by the Center to ensure compliance with the Rules, paragraph 7.

4. Factual Background

The Complainants in this administrative proceeding are Amdocs Development Ltd., a Cyprus Limited Liability Company, and Amdocs Software Systems Ltd., an Ireland Limited Liability Company and Amdocs Software Solutions LLC, an Hungary Limited Liability Company (jointly hereinafter: "the Complainant"), all of which belong to the Amdocs group of companies, which develop and market software solutions in various fields.

The Complainant is the owner of several trademark/service mark registrations for AMDOCS in various jurisdictions, including the following:

International Registration No. 1302596 AMDOCS, registered on April 11, 2016, in classes 9, 35 and 42, designating Switzerland, Israel, India and Mexico;

European Union Registration No. 015184252 AMDOCS, registered on July 13, 2016, in classes 9, 35 and 42;

Swiss Registration No. 581774 AMDOCS, registered on January 19, 2009, in classes 9, 35 and 42.

A full list of AMDOCS trademarks in the name of the Complainant is provided as Annex 5 to the Complaint.

The Complainant's website is available at "www.amdocs.com".

The disputed domain name was registered on November 17, 2024, and it redirects to the Complainant's website.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

The Complainant claims that it employs approximately 25,000 employees worldwide and serves the leading players in the communications and media industries, spanning throughout 85 countries.

The Complainant is listed on the NASDAQ Global Select Market and had a market cap of USD 10.27 billion at the end of year 2023.

The Complainant is one of the leading software developers in its field. Its name and trademark – AMDOCS – have acquired substantial goodwill by extensive use worldwide. The Complainant is the sole proprietor of all intellectual property rights in its name and trademark AMDOCS by virtue of registered trademarks as well as the goodwill it acquired as a result of the large scope of use and advertising. AMDOCS is therefore a "well-known trademark".

The disputed domain name redirects to the Complainant's website, constituting a misrepresentation intended to create the false impression that the domain name is affiliated with or owned by the Complainant. This deception appears to be designed to disguise a phishing campaign and lend an 'official' appearance to the phishing messages. The redirection check result is attached as Annex 6 to the Complaint.

The Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name; and the Respondent is not making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

There is no legitimate business reason for the Respondent to register or hold the disputed domain name in his name.

The Complainant requests the Panel to issue a decision ordering the transfer of the disputed domain name to the Complainant.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

It is well accepted that the first element functions primarily as a standing requirement. The standing (or threshold) test for confusing similarity involves a reasoned but relatively straightforward comparison between the Complainant's trademark and the disputed domain name. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition, ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the AMDOCS mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is identical to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The ".works" generic Top-Level Domain is viewed as a standard registration requirement and is generally disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test, as set forth in section 1.11.1 of [WIPO Overview 3.0](#).

The Panel finds the first element of the Policy has been established.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy provides a list of circumstances in which the Respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name.

Although the overall burden of proof in UDRP proceedings is on the complainant, panels have recognized that proving a respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in a domain name may result in the difficult task of "proving a negative", requiring information that is often primarily within the knowledge or control of the respondent. As such, where a complainant makes out a prima facie case that the respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden of production on this element shifts to the respondent to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the domain name (although the burden of proof always remains on the complainant). If the respondent fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.1.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent has not rebutted the Complainant's prima facie showing and has not come forward with any relevant evidence

demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

The Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Panel notes that, for the purposes of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy, paragraph 4(b) of the Policy establishes circumstances, in particular, but without limitation, that, if found by the Panel to be present, shall be evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith.

The Panel is satisfied that the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant's name and trademark AMDOCS mentioned in Section 4 above ("Factual Background") when it registered the disputed domain name on November 17, 2024, many years after the Complainant had registered and used the AMDOCS trademark.

The Respondent when registering the disputed domain name has targeted the Complainant's name and trademark AMDOCS and added the generic Top-Level Domain ".works", to further confuse Internet users and lead them to believe that the disputed domain name belongs to or is endorsed by the Complainant, and thereby capitalize on the fame of the Complainant's trademark.

The disputed domain name redirects to the Complainant's website, constituting a misrepresentation intended to create the false impression that the disputed domain name is affiliated with or owned by the Complainant. The Panel finds the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark.
[WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established the third element of the Policy.

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, in accordance with paragraphs 4(i) of the Policy and 15 of the Rules, the Panel orders that the disputed domain name <amdocs.works> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Miguel B. O'Farrell/

Miguel B. O'Farrell

Sole Panelist

Date: February 6, 2025